



Statement of Mary Lavin, D.C.  
on behalf of the  
Connecticut Chiropractic Association  
before the  
Committee on Public Health  
RSB 1252

Senator Handley, Representative Sayers and Members of the Committee:

My name is Mary Lavin. I am a Chiropractic Doctor with 19 years of practice experience here in the State of Connecticut. I also serve as legislative committee chairperson of the Connecticut Chiropractic Association, and I am testifying on their behalf today in opposition of **RAISED S.B. 1252, "An Act Requiring Informed Consent For Chiropractic Treatment"**.

If the bill is before you today because a constituent feels strongly about the concept and merit of informed consent, then each chapter of the General Statutes dealing with any Health care profession must be amended to require both a written and verbal informed consent, with failure to comply being grounds for disciplinary action in all fields. The Connecticut Chiropractic Association already recommends that their members utilize a written informed consent form and has made one available to our members for use in their offices. It is not the concept of informed consent that we oppose; it is the blatantly unfair singling out of our profession.

If the proponents of this bill are here because they believe it is the types of procedures or treatments performed by a chiropractor that demand additional legislative control, then this bill is still too narrow in scope. The bill should include at least the Osteopaths, Orthopedics, Naturopaths, Physical Medicine and Pain Management specialists, Occupational and Physical Therapists, Athletic Trainers, Massage Therapists, Podiatrists and Dentists. All of the above use at least some of the same procedures that are performed safely and effectively every day by a chiropractic physician. If this bill is necessary for us, then it must be extended to include these professions.

Lastly, if the primary, underlying purpose of this bill is to require informed consent before manipulation of the cervical spine because some constituents feel this procedure is too risky, then the scope of the bill is still too narrow. Other professions, such as Osteopaths, Naturopaths, and physical therapists perform this procedure on their patients with far less training, I might add, than what is provided to the chiropractors who perform the same skill. The risk of stroke following manipulation of the cervical spine has been debated, but most agree it may occur somewhere between one in every 3-6 million adjustments. If this risk is too high, then everything with a HIGHER risk ratio should have both written and oral informed consent before its use. This would include, for example, the risk of death from GI bleeding due to taking NSAID's (400 in 1,000,000).

In summary, the merits of medical informed consent are not in question here. The agenda of this bill is however, and this agenda is blatantly discriminatory, potentially inflammatory and without merit. For these reasons, we oppose the bill and ask that you take no action on it.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today. I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Mary Lavin, D.C.